

## REMARKS

In the Office Action, dated February 9, 2007, the Examiner states that Claims 29-56 are pending, Claims 29-56 are rejected, and Claims 30, 36, 39, 41-51, 53, 55, and 56 are objected to. Additionally, the specification and the drawings are objected to. By the present Amendment, Applicant amends the specification, the claims, and the drawings.

In the Office Action, the drawings are objected to because a feature of the invention specified in the claims was not shown in the drawings. Specifically, Claim 43 claims the "light emitting device coupled to the light guide by means of a lens". In order to overcome this objection, the Applicant has submitted a replacement drawing 1b identifying the lens by the reference character 15. Accordingly, the Applicant has also amended the specification to incorporate the reference character and to reference figure 1b. (The paragraph bridging page 13 and 14). Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests this objection and the corresponding objection to the specification be withdrawn. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, the specification is objected to for being unclear with respect to the use of "the or each." The Applicant has amended the specification by removing each instance "or each" and replacing each with "at least one" for clarity. Therefore, the Applicant requests this objection to the specification be withdrawn. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, Claims 30, 36, 39, 41-51, 53, 55, and 56 are objected to for containing the unclear language "the or each." To make the claims more clear, the Applicant has amended the claims by removing each instance of "or each" and replacing each with "at least one." Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to the claims be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, Claims 29-33, 36-40, 45-47, and 53-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nuam (U.S. 6,272,269) in view of Pelka et al. (U.S. 6,784,603). Additionally, Claims 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nuam and Pelka et al. in further view of Bornstein et al. (U.S. 4,539,625). Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nuam and Pelka et al., as applied to claim 29, and in further view of Miyawaki et al. (U.S. 4,832,428). Claims 42 and 50-52 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nuam and Pelka et al., as applied to claim 29, and in further view of Shahidi-Hamedani (U.S. 5,165,187). Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nuam and Pelka et al., as applied to Claim 29, and in further view of Riser et al. (U.S. 6,196,709). Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nuam and Pelka et al., as applied to Claim 29, and in further view of Grenda et al. (U.S. 6,948,840).

By the present amendment, the Applicant amends independent Claim 29 to more specifically claim that the fluorescent light and the light from the electrical power source are introduced separately into a light guide. The Applicant also adds new independent Claim 57 to claim the absorption of light from the electrically powered light source by the fluorescent dye molecules is substantially avoided by the claimed hybrid lighting system.

The amended independent Claim 29 claims a device in which electrically generated light is used to supplement fluorescent light, and is distinguishable from the inventions disclosed in the cited references. Naum et al discloses a device in which the artificially generated light is at least in part absorbed by fluorescent dye molecules to generate fluorescent light. Pelka et al discloses a medium that is doped with dye molecules and coupled to a cylindrical lens for emission of fluorescent light. Therefore, since neither Naum et al nor Pelka et al suggest or teach supplementing fluorescent light, the present invention cannot be obvious with respect to either cited reference taken separately or in combination. Moreover, the other cited references also fail to teach or suggest a device in which electrically generated light is used to supplement fluorescent light.

Because none of the cited references discloses, teaches, or suggests a device in which fluorescent light and light from an electrically powered light source are introduced separately as claimed in independent Claim 29, the Applicant considers the obviousness rejections thereto, and to the dependant claims overcome.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge our Deposit Account No. 12-0400 in the amount of \$50 to cover the fee for the excess claim 57, or any required fees in excess of the amount submitted, or credit any overpayment.

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections are considered overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,



June 5, 2007

Date

Attorney for Applicant  
Brian W. Hameder  
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP  
224 South Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60604  
(312) 427-1300  
Reg. No. 45613